

The Court has considered Plaintiff's Motion for Recusal of Magistrate Judge Keesler and finds it without merit. Plaintiff alleges no facts to support a showing of partiality or personal bias against him by Magistrate Judge Keesler. His complaints, insofar as the Court can infer, appear to stem from his dissatisfaction of rulings made by Magistrate Judge Keesler in prior cases. "Alleging bias or prejudice of a judge's views or rulings that arise from facts or events of current or prior proceedings is an insufficient basis for recusal unless the opinions 'display a deep-seated favoritism or antagonism that would make fair judgments impossible.'" United States v. Blackwell, No. 3:04-cr-00040, 2008 WL 4222026 at *2 (W.D.Va. Sep. 15, 2008) (quoting Liteky v. United States, 510 U.S. 540, 555 (1994)).

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Recusal (Doc. No. 12) is **DENIED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff is warned that further filing of frivolous documents in this Court could result in Rule 11 sanctions and the issuing of a pre-filing injunction order. Such sanctions could issue *sua sponte*, that is, without motion from Defendants.

Signed: October 7, 2013



Robert J. Conrad, Jr.
United States District Judge

